

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Saria Walker,)	
)	C.A. No. 6:22-2946-HMH-KFM
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	OPINION & ORDER
)	
United States Federal Government, House)	
of Raeford Farm, Inc., Prisma Health,)	
Saint Frances Downtown, Saint Frances)	
Eastside, The Carolina Center for)	
Behavioral Health, South Carolina)	
Department of Social Services, Greer)	
Police Department, Greenville Police)	
Department, Greenville County Court of)	
Common Pleas, GreenLink, Greenville)	
Library System,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina.¹ Saria Walker (“Walker”), proceeding pro se, alleges various Constitutional violations, violations of various federal statutes, and various other state and federal claims. In his Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge McDonald

¹ The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

recommended that this action be dismissed without prejudice, without leave to amend, and without issuance and service of process. In addition, Magistrate Judge McDonald further recommended that the court warn Walker regarding the entry of sanctions in the future should she continue to file frivolous litigation in this court.

Walker filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Walker's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate her claims. Accordingly, after review, the court finds that Walker's objections are without merit. Therefore, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge McDonald's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference.

It is therefore

ORDERED that this action is dismissed without prejudice, without leave to amend, and without issuance and service of process. **The court warns the plaintiff that continuing to file duplicative and frivolous litigation in this court could lead to the imposition of sanctions.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
February 2, 2023

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The Plaintiff is hereby notified that she has the right to appeal this order within sixty (60) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.